1880-81
(L.R.)

Fl. No. 29 of 80
1-5

Sub: Refund of Agra Revenue collected on minor Inam held by Bhagu Bhanji and family.

RF. 42 of 44

G. R. S. IX-5]

1880-81

Previous references.
L. R. 30 of 75

191 .
(L. R.)

File No. L 9 of 80

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later references.
L R. 28 of 81
" 54 of 93.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 5

Majors ~~Part~~ B for March 1882.

SUBJECT.

Refund of excess revenue Collected on minor Inams held by Rulvay Deoraj Urs family.

Indexed

W D 88—GPE—50,000—24-7-16

Section 1871.

File No 19 From

Serial No To

Secretary to Chief Commissioner,
Revenue General Department.

Dated 19 February

Despatched

Received 21/2

ENCLOSURES NO { 2 bills with vouchers
1 Verifyer

General-No. 129 } 1870 —81
R No.

Submits for sanction a Revised Expenditure for Rs 3,159-4-5 spent on collections on Income of the Anchory family, Bauphlae District.

21.2.81

Dead Season

(2)

R. No. 159

Bangalore District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
19th February 1891.

To

The Secretary to the
Chief Commissioner
of Mysore
Revenue Deptt:

Sir,

With reference to the Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 6596-41 dated 7th March 1891, I have the honour to submit for correction, a revised Refund bill and to request Treasury Officer's Credit Certificate for Rs 3,53-4-8 being the Amount of Excess collection made on the Minor Inams attached to the Railway Family Inam Bangalore District, together with Vernacular papers connected therewith.

2- ... Court of Appeal dated the 6th day of March 1944 was heard by Mr. Justice Varadachariar, a Subordinate Judge of Chingleput, Mr. Advocate General Ramachandra Iyer and Mr. Advocate Venkatarama Sastri for the Appellant and Mr. Advocate Krishnaswami Iyengar for the Respondents. The Appellant claimed to be entitled to the whole of the Suit property as the sole surviving member of the Joint Family consisting of himself and his father, the Respondents.

(1) First Respondent is the widow of the Appellant's brother Ramaswami and the Respondents (2) to (5) are the children of the said Ramaswami. The Appellant's case is that the Suit property was purchased by him and his brother Ramaswami as Joint Family property and that the Respondents are not entitled to any share in the Suit property. The Respondents on the other hand contended that the Suit property was purchased by Ramaswami with his own separate funds and that the Appellant was not entitled to any share in the Suit property.

(4)

-savage, Asst of the Lindsay family -

(2) That if the Refund is granted to Mr Savage, it will give room for other Ratepayers like himself to set up a claim for the Refund demanded in the interest of the family and the family with the knowledge of the Municipality which has been acknowledged by the Loan Department.

3. Beg to add that the Loan Department has registered the Ratepayer in question in the name of the Lindsay Ratepayers Family Association, family list portion of the case N° 12 Court Roll, and has referred the Lindsay Ratepayers to the Civil Court as regards his application to set Ratepayer from possession of the land -.

4- Under such circumstances Beg to submit for the City

whether the Amount fixed by Maintenance or Account of Allegiance should be referred to Hon. Judge or Whether Allegiance should be settled by the Question in Civil Courts -

5. Stamp Act - Question, Whether for the Orders for the Payment of Commissioners, the Agent stamp is necessary, since Act 1589, from the Mysore Civil Regulations - since those cases the Parties Affidavits should be Granted, and to which the Same Opinion Act Act 1589 Agent for necessary the Party Desires to be Paid the Payment of Witnesses &c. - Conducts the Same Settlement the Parties of Affidavits Should

in that of Richmond.

(6)

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obt. servt

S. Ruthell

Dy Commissioner

WT

Read :- (25)

(7)



Letter No. 429 of the 19 February 1881 from the Personal of the Bangalore District.

No. 4309-10 & Order thereon :-
175 / 22/8/81.

The orders conveyed in Proceedings No. 57/53. of the 6th May 1799 confirming as Inam on ½ assessment the lands long held by the Dalwai family have reference only to lands now in their Enjoyment, and not to such as may have been alienated by the family & others. The aliences have no claim whatever to the favorable terms, and lands in their possession though originally belonging to the Dalwai should be

struck off the Inam settlement and brought under full assessment.

In the case under notice, it is not clear on what grounds the Inam Department treated Krishna Swamiji as a Sub-tenant as regards the Alienated paliya lands held by him. He states that he acquired the lands by purchase, in which case he will be clearly an alienee and not a mere sub-tenant; and the matter should be settled accordingly. If any of the lands are held by Sub-tenants on rent from the Dalvai family, such lands could be confirmed in the name

(9)

of the Talukdar on the
favorable terms sanctioned

2. The rejected item
2,747-0-4 being the difference
between the assessment
imposed by the Inam Settlement
and the Survey assessment
paid by the Talukdar
on account of minor
Inams, excluding the
sum of Rs 406-4-4 on account
of the Kharijan[illegible] lands above referred
to, is sanctioned.

H. Leth.

To the Commissioner
& the Superintendent with
the corrected Register
file

No. 4311/46 Copy to the Collr:
of Kanara for information
& guidance.

No. 4312/46 The Inam Supdt

4 25 1881.

Jo

2/

(10)

The Dy Comm[r] Bourgeo

" Comptroller.

" Dy Comm[r] of Dryd

" Quam Cuperd

Dy 22[nd] Augt 1881.

Pa[d] 1

K 0 4 309-10 / 175 — 4311 / 118 — H 3

Accounts received

on account of Sheep collec

on Crown Lands of the

Districts in the Bourke Land

1/12-87 K 0 4 309-10 - 2.

(General-Serial No. 30.)

188 /.

From

Section 1 To 2
File No 29-30 1/2
Serial No 3

Peramjee Esq
Mysore

Dated 6/

Despatched Sep. 8

Received

Enclosures No. 1.

General No. 4776
No. 823.

In reply to
Letter No 5 of 2 Sep 87
from Secretary Govt
for information
the enclosed copy of
this Office Letter No
4309-19 of 23rd Aug 87
sanctioning the refund
of Rs 1-10-0 paid in
excess Collection on
account of Opium stated
to be Rs 3 per
Family in
the Bangalore District

Secretary

Mysore
5/9/87.

(General Serial No. 29.)

OFFICE OF THE 1005 3

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore Distt.

Section X To 12

No. 29

Serial No.

The Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, Department.

Dated 10th March 1882

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 1882

No. 1882

Sir

I have the honor to request that the Vernacular papers in connection with the refusal of Excise collection made on Mines Lands belonging to the Ludwig family submitted with this Office Ro 729 dated 19th February 1881 may be kindly returned to this office for reference

I have &c

Dy Commissioner

(13)

89

(General Serial No. 360)

1882

From Section 2 C 1-80

File No

Serial No 5 — 30

To The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore

Dated 14th March

Despatched —

Received

Enclosures No. Nil

General No. 9389
No. 45-2

As requested in his
docket No 912 of the 9th
instant, returning the Com-
=cular papers connected with
the refund of excess collections
made on account Brass be-
longing to the Dairy farm

By order

Sd
Dr Secy.